

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 14-662V

Filed: December 3, 2014

Not for Publication

\*\*\*\*\*

GRETCHEN BRADY EBRIGHT,

\*

\*

Petitioner,

\*

\*

v.

\*

\*

SECRETARY OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

\*

\*

\*

Respondent.

\*

\*

Damages decision based on proffer;  
influenza (flu) vaccine; shoulder  
injury related to vaccine  
administration (SIRVA)

\*\*\*\*\*

James R. Moyles, Harrisburg, PA, for petitioner.

Ann D. Martin, Washington, DC, for respondent.

**MILLMAN, Special Master**

### **DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES<sup>1</sup>**

On July 28, 2014, petitioner filed a petition under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10–34 (2006), alleging that she suffered a left shoulder injury as a result of the influenza (“flu”) vaccination she received on November 8, 2013. On November 19, 2014, respondent filed her Rule 4(c) Report, conceding that petitioner suffered from a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) and recommending compensation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall redact such material from public access.

On December 3, 2014, respondent filed Respondent's Proffer on Award of Compensation. The undersigned finds the terms of the proffer to be reasonable. Based on the record as a whole, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to the award as stated in the proffer. Pursuant to the terms stated in the attached proffer, the court awards a lump sum payment of **\$90,000.00**, representing all elements of compensation to which petitioner would be entitled under 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-15(a). The award shall be in the form of a check for **\$90,000.00** made payable to petitioner.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 3, 2014

/s/ Laura D. Millman  
Laura D. Millman  
Special Master

---

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party, either separately or jointly, filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.



VINCENT J. MATANOSKI  
Deputy Director  
Torts Branch, Civil Division

GLENN A. MACLEOD  
Senior Trial Counsel  
Torts Branch, Civil Division

s/ Ann D. Martin  
ANN D. MARTIN  
Senior Trial Attorney  
Torts Branch, Civil Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 146  
Benjamin Franklin Station  
Washington, D.C. 20044-0146  
Telephone: (202) 307-1815

Dated: December 3, 2014